IS FOREIGN IMMIGRATION THE SOLUTION TO RURAL DEPOPULATION?
THE CASE OF CATALONIA (1996-2009)

Abstract: This paper analyses, from a demographic perspective, how foreign immigration has affected Catalan municipalities under 1000 inhabitants. After decades losing population, this group of villages is, despite its ongoing negative natural growth rate, recently regaining population due to immigration. Nevertheless, not all these municipalities have followed the same path. The local population register or Padrón has been used to build a typology which classifies these villages on the basis of their Spanish and foreign population growth between 1996 and 2009. Results show that, despite practically all of them received foreign immigrants, approximately half still lose population or have poor increases. Therefore, the international immigration boom has emphasized the spatial dichotomy between a few dynamic rural areas and the rest, which largely occupy inland Catalonia. Only tourist municipalities, mainly receiving foreign immigrants, and those located near urban centres, basically benefiting from Spanish nationality suburban flows, have been able to clearly put an end to depopulation.
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1. Introduction

From 1996 to the beginning of the current crisis, Spain received the largest immigration flows in Europe, obtaining 70 per cent of its demographic growth from them (Bayona and Gil-Alonso, 2012). In 1996, only 542,314 foreigners resided in the country, that is to say, solely 1.4 per cent of the population came under this title in statistics. However, in 2010, they are 5,747,734 (January the 1st Padvón data), representing 12.2 per cent of the total population figures. Though the main bulk of these flows has settled in urban areas, rural areas have also received significant numbers of foreigners (Pumares, 2003), who presently represent 6.7 per cent of the population living in Spanish rural (<1000 inhabitants) municipalities. The latter had been losing population since the 1950s and, despite the emergence of return flows the two last decades (Recaño, 2004, Lardiés, 2005), were suffering a severe ageing process. Though several rural areas have been able to stop their depopulation and ageing processes due to the settlement of foreign immigrants (Collantes et al., 2010), this phenomenon has obtained little attention from the literature.

Still, recent socio-economic and demographic changes in Spanish rural municipalities, and particularly the arrival of locally relevant volumes of foreigners, suggest the importance of posing certain questions such as:

(1) whether this implies the birth of a new rural population recovery phase or it is only a circumstantial situation determined by short-term economic factors;

(2) whether foreign immigrants are substituting a declining Spanish population or, on the contrary, their arrival would be stimulating autochthonous rural population growth;
and, finally, whether these spatially diversified inflows are intensifying differences between more and less dynamic rural areas.

This paper precisely intends to use small (<1000 inhabitants) Catalan municipalities as a case study to analyse the formerly mentioned issues. After a revision of the literature on foreign immigration to rural areas and a description of how the Catalan countryside has socially, economically and demographically been transformed by this new population, the paper introduces its own results, which are divided into three sub-sections. The first analyses how the arrival of foreign immigrants has demographically affected these municipalities. The second shows foreigners’ settlement patterns, and finally, the third and last establishes a municipality typology to differentiate the more dynamic from the less dynamic ones. Main results are discussed at the conclusions.

_Padrón Continuo_ –local official register, published every year by the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE)– collecting data up to January the 1st 2009 (2010 data by municipality were still not available when research concluded) has been used as the main data source. Most Spanish demographers regard its quality as acceptable\(^1\) and consider it a particularly adequate source to measure the impact of immigration, as all the inhabitants of a given municipality, even aliens without residence permit, must, and usually do, register in it, because this gives them access to the public health and education systems (Gil-Alonso, 2010).

2. State of the art: foreign migrants in rural areas

For the last few decades, traditional rural-urban movements –i.e. ‘rural exodus’ (Hannan, 1970)– have been substituted, or complemented, by urban-rural flows, known in the literature as ‘counterurbanisation’ (Berry, 1976; Fielding, 1982; Dean _et al._, 1984; Champion, 1989). Several social sciences like Geography, Demography and
Sociology have focused on immigration in rural areas (see for instance Hugo and Smailes, 1985; Harper, 1991; Ilbery, 1998; Hoggart and Paniagua, 2001), and new concepts like ‘rural gentrification’, ‘neo-rural’ migrants and ‘lifestyle migration’ have been proposed (Hoggart, 1997; Halfacree, 1998; Hugo and Bell, 1998; Benson and O’Reilly, 2009). More specifically, certain studies have focused on changes and conflicts –including social class ones (Fielding, 1998)– which these new inhabitants, usually more educated and affluent than local ones, have caused in rural areas (for different Spanish cases see, for instance, Paniagua, 2002; Rivera, 2009; and Solana-Solana, 2010).

Most studies have analysed rural immigration as a form of internal migration. Nevertheless, international migration movements towards rural areas are increasingly present. These flows, called ‘international counterurbanisation’ by some authors (Buller and Hoggart, 1994; Halfacree, 2008), adopt diverse forms: ‘Retirement migration’, namely, retired people in search of sun (King et al., 2000; Gustafson, 2009); ‘return migration’, that is to say, migrants returning to rural areas in their countries of origin (e.g. Ni Laoire, 2007, for the Irish case); and, finally, ‘labour or economic migration’, that is, migrants from developing countries reaching developed country rural areas in search of labour opportunities (see, for instance, Hugo, 2008, for rural Australia). The latter are performing what Halfacree (2008: 489) calls ‘default counterurbanisation’: “people who have ‘moved to the rural’, usually from abroad, so may also be seen as part of the ‘international counterurbanisation’ strand of labour migrants for whom the ‘rural’ character of the place is almost wholly incidental. [However, they are] a vital part of the migration-driven socio-cultural restructuring of the rural”. According to Nelson and Nelson (2010), there would even be a mutual feedback between the two phenomena i.e.
counterurbanisation and labour or economic migration. New labour niches created by ‘counterurbanisers’ would have increasingly been occupied by foreign immigrants.

Abundantly referenced Latin-Americans working in rural United States (Kandel and Cromartie, 2004; Zúñiga and Hernández-León, 2005) or foreign migrants in the British countryside, would be examples of this phenomenon. According to Rogaly (2008: 497) “international migrants have very recently become the major workforce in the [British] labour-intensive horticulture […], in a general pattern of intensification of horticultural production driven by an ongoing process of concentration in retailer power, and in the greater availability of migrant workers, shaped in part by state initiatives to manage immigration”. However, this process is particularly relevant in South European new immigration countries such as Greece (Kasimis, 2008, Kasimis and Papadopoulos, 2005; Lazaridis and Psimmenos, 2000), Portugal (Fonseca, 2008), Italy (King, 2002) or Spain (Hoggart and Mendoza, 1999; Morén and Solana, 2004; Morén, 2005; Domingo et al. 1995; Rivera, 2009; Gualda and Ruiz, 2004). These are countries which have highly segmented labour markets and an extensive family-based informal economy (King, 2000), in which agriculture (especially the intensive one) has been one of the economic activities that –together with construction, tourism, domestic service and other low added value sectors– has attracted more international migrants. Yet, immigrants’ role in southern European rural areas is not restricted to agriculture, as they are also involved in other non-agrarian economic activities such as construction or supporting elderly populations (Kasimis, 2008). These latter activities have even attracted foreign immigrants in marginal or mountainous agriculture rural areas.

Besides labour opportunities in rural areas themselves, some nationalities also consider these villages as a gateway to the receiving country’s wider labour market. This is particularly so in the Spanish case, as labour legislation favours migration to
rural areas by allowing groups of foreign workers to be contracted at their country of origin to cover certain specific agricultural job needs –e.g. picking a particular fruit harvest. Additionally, agriculture has also attracted workers lacking a residence permit, as they have more difficulties in finding a job in more regulated activity sectors. However, having migrated to these rural areas does not necessarily imply that they permanently settle there. In fact, many foreigners move from villages towards more urbanised areas when they achieve higher labour stability –derived from obtaining a legal residence permit (Pumares, 2005; Domingo and Bayona, 2007, for Moroccans).

From a purely demographic point of view, immigrant settlement has allowed diminishing or, in some cases even reversing, Spain’s rural depopulation and ageing processes (Collantes et al. 2010). This recovery has been reinforced by the arrival of autochthonous urban migrants to specific villages. In others, however, the arrival of non-nationals has not been totally able to compensate the departure of young local people to cities. Additionally, the settlement of young male migrants could also have reinforced one of rural area’s endemic problems, its masculinisation (Camarero et al. 2009). In sum, a demographic and spatial dichotomy between the more expansive and the less developed rural areas, which we intend to analyse using Catalan rural areas as a case study, seems to have emerged.

3. Rural Catalonia, an unevenly transformed region

3.1. Small municipalities’ recent history: from rural exodus to new urban-rural flows

Even though most Spanish studies define rural municipalities as those which have less than 10,000 inhabitants, here the limit has been established at 1,000 inhabitants. This means that the present research includes 480 out of the 946 Catalan municipalities,
that is to say, nearly half of them. This threshold avoids studying Comarca\textsuperscript{2} capitals, which normally have larger, less rural and more dynamic populations than their surrounding villages.

Municipalities analysed are generally situated in inner Catalonia (see figure 1), and occupy a significant part of this Spanish region (51.4 per cent of its total area). According to the January the 1\textsuperscript{st} 2009 Padrón, approximately 200,000 people live in these small municipalities –192,362, to be more exact– and they represent 2.6 per cent of the Catalan population. 18,000 of the former would be foreign residents, that is to say, 9.4 per cent of the total rural population.

**FIGURE 1**

From the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} Century, and throughout most of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, the dominant migratory trend in these villages was rural exodus to Barcelona and other industrial cities (Vidal Bendito, 1979). The departure of the reproductive age population –causing negative natural growth rates– led to population decline and ageing. This well-known phenomenon is both the cause and the consequence of the crisis and downfall of the ‘traditional’ land-use model, which did not only include subsistence agriculture, but other economic activities such as forestry, mining, or certain types of proto-industry (Sancho-Reinoso, 2011; Guirado, 2011).

In the 1950s and 1960s, when the transition from the ‘traditional phase’ to the ‘productivist’ one accelerated in the analysed area, rural depopulation intensified and many fields, particularly those in mountain regions, stopped being farmed. In other words, the development of an industrial production model implied that large volumes of traditionally farmed land were transformed into competitive, market oriented
agricultural holdings. At the same time, mechanisation and the abandonment of non-competitive farms led to massive work force losses (Bowler, 1992; Lowe et al., 1993; Lockwood, 1999). Those Catalan rural areas which did not undergo these transformations became marginal, periphery lands (Guirado, 2011). Though rural emigration accelerated in the 1970s, the 1980s give birth to a new phase, i.e., ‘post-productivism’. New economic activities, such as rural tourism, organic farming, construction or tertiary sector ones were added or party substituted the previously existing ones and, subsequently, Catalan rural-urban migratory flows begin to fall. Moreover, certain villages even started to receive urban immigrants. At first, only those municipalities which were closest to cities did, and then those further away (Soriano and Tulla, 2002; García-Coll and Sánchez-Aguilera, 2005). This new demographic trend, particularly observed in the more dynamic and economically diversified rural areas, has intensified in the early 21st century. At the same time, foreign immigrants also start to arrive.

3.2. Who are these urbanites moving into Catalan rural areas?

As early as the 1970s, some urban dwellers that rejected the dominant economic and social system, and searched an alternative way of life in harmony with nature and the community, were the first to settle at small municipalities. This initial ‘return to the countryside’ was based on what some authors call the ‘rural idyll’, that is to say, a positive image surrounding many aspects of rural lifestyle, community and landscape (Ilbery, 1998; Halfacree, 1998). Later, urban-rural flows became increasingly significant and heterogeneous as rural areas acquired new functions due to economic restructuring. According to Guirado (2011) recent settlement of urbanites in rural Catalonia could be explained by three main processes: the development of the tourist
industry, the progressive expansion of public administration throughout rural areas, and the improvement of countryside living conditions.

Indeed, in many Catalan rural areas, tourism –and second home construction derived from it (López-Colás and Módenes, 2005)– has substituted farming as the key economic driver (González-Rodríguez, 2011, Guirado, 2011; Sancho-Reinoso, 2011). The development of tourism has generated many new, though mainly temporary, jobs which are generally covered, during the high season, by people who come from outside the area. Nevertheless, these jobs have also avoided the departure of local young adults for work related reasons, or have even permitted those who had already left to earn their living in cities to return. Thus, these economic and demographic transformations have been particularly significant in those rural areas in which the tourist industry flourishes, such as the Pyrenees³ or villages close to the sea. However, those small municipalities in which the development of winter or summer tourism is more difficult continue bearing former, less positive, demographic trends.

On their side, in the 1980s, public administrations started to spread throughout rural areas. Spain was then becoming a democratic and de-centralised country and, under the new Constitution (1978), had adopted, a system which had strong regional governments called Comunidades Autonomas. As the new Catalan government developed, it increasingly took over responsibilities on rural areas (Sancho-Reinoso, 2011). Therefore, newer services and infrastructures were offered, and new technical and administrative organisations were progressively created there. For instance, the 1987 Catalan law called Llei d’Organització Comarcal de Catalunya created Comarca councils (see footnote 2) which have taken over land planning, health, education, culture, sports, and environment responsibilities. At the same time, local councils also started to be better financed. Therefore, all these institutions started providing services
which rural areas had formerly never enjoyed. Mountainous areas also benefited from additional financing provided by the *Ley de Agricultura de Montaña* (1982 mountainous agriculture Spanish law) and the *Llei d’Alta Muntanya* (1983 high mountain area Catalan law). Finally, when Spain entered the European Union (1986), Catalan agriculture had gradually to adapt to the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) but also benefited from European rural development programmes like the Leader initiative, and cohesion and regional policy funds (Structural Funds, European Social Funds, etc.).

Managing all this funding and the creation of all these new organisations, institutions and infrastructures (schools, health services, roads, etc.), generated a considerable demand for skilled professionals (teachers, doctors, engineers, technicians, skilled workers), that, as it could not exclusively be covered by locals, also attracted a significant number of urban immigrants (Guirado, 2011).

Finally, as cities increasingly expand and information technologies currently make teleworking easier, rural and urban area living conditions are becoming similar, so urban dwellers are progressively being persuaded to move to rural areas. Urbanites searching to improve their quality of life could now live in an attractive environment in which they could develop their own new (micro) businesses, create new jobs, or work as self-employed or freelance workers, without having to renounce to urban life comforts. In sum, they could now combine certain elements symbolically identified as rural and others associated to urban life (Guirado, 2011). This has given birth to a totally new and different middle class, which came from urban areas. While local middle classes were made up of farmers who had become businessmen or people who had formerly emigrated to cities to work or study, this new urban-origin middle class is usually better educated and economically more affluent, and has a higher cultural level and totally different social habits. Though there has been ‘rural gentrification’ in certain
Catalan villages, Solana-Solana (2010) believes that rather than local population being replaced by ‘rural gentrifiers’, both are uneasily cohabiting.

3.3. Rural economic restructuration and foreign immigrants

As certain rural areas have gained vitality and differences between rural and urban living standards have been reduced, some authors claim there is a ‘rural rebirth’ (Camarero, 1993), while others talk about a ‘rural turnaround’, ‘rural shift’ or ‘rural modernisation’ (Fuguitt, 1985; Frey, 1988; Jollivet, 1997). For others, there is a ‘new rurality’ in which agricultural and productive components formerly defining ‘rurality’, now play a residual role (Ratier, 2002; Solana, 2005), while the ‘post-productivist’ concepts of rural spaces related to consumption, leisure and quality of life become the new key elements (Ilbery and Bowler, 1998; Halfacree, 1999; Marsden, 1999).

For Guirado (2011), the former concepts would however be different from that of ‘rural restructuration’ used by other authors (Bradley and Lowe, 1984; Marsden et al., 1993; Hoggart and Paniagua, 2001; Elbersen, 2001). This latter concept would focus on production aspects and the role that, within the constant restructuration of capitalism (Woods, 2005), production offshoring and the new spatial division of labour (Massey, 1984) are having in the social, political, spatial and cultural reconfiguration of rural areas. Therefore, as production continues to be the key element in the system, rather than using the term ‘post-productivism’, the one employed should be ‘neo-productivism’. Some authors (Marsden, 2012; Burton and Wilson, 2012) have recently used this concept to define a new paradigm –subsequent to post-productivism– which dovetails with the growing moral and health concerns of reflexive consumers (Marsden, 2012) and would be applicable to the current global food crisis which started in 2007. This new paradigm intends to explain how the agri-food system is adapting to the
increasing volatility of global food markets (including depletion of global food stocks as growing extensions of productive areas are being used to produce bio-fuels rather than food) while trying to re-integrate food security with sustainability (Burton and Wilson, 2012) and creating synergies between ecology and economy (Marsden, 2012). However, the present article, uses the concept of ‘neo-productivism’ as Menor-Toribio (2000) or Armesto (2005) had previously defined it, that is to say, as the way in which productivism has adapted to globalisation. Indeed, the first to employ this concept in Spain was Menor-Toribio (2000), who believes that the transition between two different agricultural production models (productivism and post-productivism) would merely be a ‘neofordist’ or ‘neoproductivist’ adaptation of capitalism to obtain profits from increased agrarian flexibility, using less inputs to reduce costs and increasing the importance given to product quality. Similarly, Armesto (2005) considers ‘neoproductivism’ as the way large food corporations have adapted to the ‘green’ fashion, or in other words, to the rapid growth of ecologically aware health-conscious consumers who are willing to pay more for ‘bio’ products. This interpretation of ‘neoproductivism’ as another way of continuing productivism, considers that production (whatever rural areas produce: food, but also leisure and high quality of life spaces) still continues to be the core analytical element. Changes in rural area production systems can therefore be analysed by studying how employment in the diverse economic sectors has been transformed through time.

Using this theoretical framework to analyse the Catalan case, it could be argued that agrarian restructuring has led rural areas to significant farming and livestock rearing job losses –around 80% of these in small villages (González-Rodríguez, 2011)– while employment in the tourist industry, the rest of the tertiary sector and construction have dramatically grown. For instance, in 1991, 34.4 per cent of those working in the
municipalities under study were employed in the primary sector, these villages’ main economic activity then. However, in 2001, figures drop to only 20.2 per cent –still a significant share, compared to only 2.5 per cent in Catalonia as a whole. Conversely, between 1991 and 2001, services sector jobs grew by 77 per cent, while the share of people working in it grew from 31.4 per cent to 47.4 per cent, becoming the main economic activity of the smallest municipalities.

As the services industry is generating new jobs in the Catalan rural areas, small villages have attracted immigrants from the rest of Catalonia, from other Spanish regions and, increasingly, from abroad (Guirado, 2011, González-Rodríguez, 2011). Among recent research analysing international migration flows to Catalan rural areas from a global perspective, there is García-Coll and Sánchez-Aguilera (2005), which covers the 1981-2001 period. Even though it refers to the years just before the international immigration boom started, it already shows that foreigners were having an increasing impact on rural demographic growth. Other studies have adopted a more local perspective, focusing for example on the Empordà, Terra Alta, Pallars Sobirà, and Ribagorça comarques (Solana, 2005; Morén, 2005; González-Rodríguez, 2011, Guirado, 2011; Sancho-Reinoso, 2011) or on the Ebro region (Pujadas et al. 2003). The economic or labour consequences of this process have also been studied. Gozálvez and López-Trigal (1999) underline that the phenomenon is rather complex as, besides participating in agriculture, international immigrants are also increasingly involved in all the other economic sectors. Furthermore, there are also significant amounts of (mainly EU) foreigners who have moved, particularly after retirement, to Catalan rural areas for residential reasons.

In sum, researchers generally agree that when small municipalities receive international immigrants many aspects of these societies are affected (García-Sanz,
2006; Camarero et al., 2009). This paper specifically focuses on their demographic and spatial consequences, taking the Catalan rural municipalities as study case.

4. Results

4.1. Foreign immigrants’ increasing role in Catalan rural population

In the first eight decades of the twentieth century, Catalan population multiplied by three mainly due to immigration from the rest of Spain. After a fifteen year long (1981-1996) stagnation period, during which the Catalan population barely increased from 5,959,530 to 6,090,040 inhabitants, a new explosive growth phase commences in the second half of the 1990s, and this time, foreign population would be the main demographic driver. Due to the net arrival of 1,091,578 foreigners to Catalonia between 1996 and 2009, their numbers rose from 97,701 to 1,189,279. In other words, foreigners were responsible for 78.8 per cent of that period’s demographic growth and represented 15.9 per cent of the 2009 total Catalan registered population (7,475,420 inhabitants).

However, this impressive population growth spread unevenly across Catalonia. Whereas most of metropolitan and coastal municipalities increased their population very significantly, 172 Catalan municipalities –basically rural ones– continued to show negative growth rates. Indeed, throughout the 20th and the early 21st century, Catalan rural areas have undergone outstanding population losses. From 1900 to 2009, rural residents –those living in municipalities under 1,000 inhabitants– fell from 314,930 to 192,362 (a 39 per cent decrease). In other words, they went from representing 16 per cent of the Catalan population to only 2.6 per cent.

As several municipalities have changed group due to population size variations, former figures can, to a certain extent, be considered as deceptive. Therefore, figure 2
takes another perspective. Here, only nuclei which had less than 1,000 inhabitants in 2009 have been selected and followed for the entire century. Strong population losses are confirmed from 1920 onwards, though particularly from 1960 to 1980. In the 1980’s and early 1990’s, this trend slows down. Then, in the late nineties new foreign immigration inflows appear and gradually consolidate. Subsequently, growth rates change sign and population significantly augments. Between 1996 (167,095 inhabitants) and 2009 (192,362 residents), numbers rise by 15.2 per cent. This trend reaches most rural nuclei as 69.6 per cent of them gain residents and only 30.4 per cent continue to lose them. These 25,267 new dwellers imply that, in 2009, municipalities under 1,000 inhabitants regained their mid-1970s population (figure 2)\(^5\), therefore putting an end to their 20\(^{th}\) century long population loss.

**FIGURE 2**

Even though 9,291 out of these 25,267 new residents are Spanish citizens (5.6 per cent increase), 15,976 are foreigners. Therefore, the latter have multiplied their 1996 numbers by nine. In sum, the main explanation to this new positive demographic trend in rural Catalonia is international migration, directly responsible for 63.2 per cent of this rise.

**4.2. Foreigners’ settlement patterns by nationality**

In 2009, 96.3 per cent of the Catalan municipalities under 1,000 inhabitants had at least one foreigner among their residents, compared to only 67 per cent in 1996. Interestingly enough, foreigners’ origins vary by municipality size (figure 3). Above half (59.5 per cent to be more exact) of all the foreigners residing in the smallest municipalities are Europeans, either former EU-15 citizens or other European country nationals. In recent years, the latter –63.7 per cent of them Romanians– have rapidly
grown and become the most numerous group. By contrast, in larger municipalities their share is much lower.

FIGURE 3

American –mostly Latin-Americans– and Asian origin foreigners show the opposite trend, as their proportion in the smallest villages is significantly low and increases as municipality size does. Members of both groups of nationalities tend to work in the tertiary sector, and therefore normally reside in larger towns and cities. Finally, the proportions of African origin aliens –mainly Moroccans– living in municipalities with less than 1,000 inhabitants and those in larger ones are similar.

FIGURE 4

Figure 4 shows foreign population size in each of the villages analysed. Aliens tend to concentrate in four geographical areas, though, again, their distribution by nationality is clearly uneven:

a) Small villages at the Empordà comarca (Girona province, in North-Eastern Catalonia, near the Costa Brava). 44.3 per cent of their foreigners are EU citizens, mostly retired French, German, and British people, who have moved to these tourist villages for residential reasons. In Solana-Solana’s (2010) words, the migrant “appreciates the combination of attractive natural and agrarian landscapes and the historical and aesthetic characteristics of towns and villages”. There are also significant numbers of Africans and (Latin) Americans;

b) Certain interior nuclei within the Tarragona province (South-Western Catalonia, close to the Costa Daurada). Europeans (EU members or not) and Africans are the
main origins to be found. These villages are near the Costa Daurada resorts and, at the same time, offer low skilled unstable farming jobs (Pujadas et al. 2003).

c) Tourism orientated Pyrenean villages (North-Western Catalonia). Europeans, (Latin) Americans, and, to a minor extent, Africans, would be particularly abundant. Depending on the season, winter or adventure tourism (rafting, trekking, mountain biking, etc.) is developed in them (González-Rodríguez, 2011, Guirado, 2011; Sancho-Reinoso, 2011).

d) Segrià and Urgell agrarian plains (Lleida province, Western Catalonia). Non-EU European and African nationals are especially numerous here, while Americans and EU citizens are scarce. These villages offer abundant seasonal low-skilled jobs during fruit harvests (Bayona and Gil-Alonso, 2010).

In sum, in the Empordà and in Tarragona’s charming villages, located not far from the coast, (mainly retired) EU nationals predominate. They are also significant in the Pyrenees. Non-EU European citizens are found in all four areas, but are particularly numerous in Lleida and Tarragona interior farming municipalities. Africans are everywhere, but less in the Pyrenees, where (Latin) Americans are much more relevant due to the development of tourism. This latter group is also numerous in the Empordà. Finally, very few villages have significant numbers of Asians.

4.3. Foreigner and Spanish population growth. A rural municipality typology

As the paper’s main aim is to study demographic dynamics spatially reshaping scarcely populated Catalan areas, municipalities under 1,000 inhabitants have been classified by population growth rates per nationality –Spanish or foreign. Therefore, to try to obtain spatial trends we have established a typology grouping small municipalities into several categories, ranging from villages which have increasing foreigner figures
but a decreasing or stagnant Spanish population, to those where both groups have grown though the former substantially more, and finally those in which Spaniards have augmented even more than foreigners.

Thus, three variables (Spanish, foreigner and overall population change between 1996 and 2009) have been employed to group the 480 municipalities through hierarchical cluster analysis, resulting in 5 categories. As many municipalities received non-nationals for the first time, growth rates were not representative. Absolute figures have therefore been preferred. Despite the typology’s simplicity, results clearly point to the existence of major differences within rural Catalonia.

**TABLE 1**

Table 1 shows typology results by category, and indicates whether the increase has been positive or negative, and its intensity. Using birth and death register data, authors have additionally calculated natural growth rates for each category and the estimated migratory one (by subtracting natural growth from total growth).

Category 1 contains 56 villages, 11.7 per cent of those analysed, and holds 15.3 per cent of the rural population. In this 13 year long period, it has lost 3,215 inhabitants (5,183 Spaniards less, partially compensated by 1,978 new foreigners). Therefore, on average, each village pertaining to this category lost 92 Spanish inhabitants and only gained 35 foreigners, that is to say, it had an overall loss of 57 residents. Type 1 municipalities mainly lost population through natural growth (-3,293 people), though they won 78 inhabitants due to a positive, but scarce, net migration. In other words, foreign immigration flows would not have been large enough to counterbalance both natural population growth losses and Spanish people leaving. In sum, category 1
villages, which those years lost a 10 per cent of their population, can be considered as the less demographically dynamic municipalities.

Category 2 holds 179 municipalities, 37.3 per cent of those studied and 21.4 per cent of the population. Throughout this period, their figures remained basically stagnant. On average, each municipality lost 10 Spanish nationality inhabitants while it gained 10 foreign ones. Like category 1 villages, their natural growth has been negative (-3,590). Nonetheless, their positive migratory rates (+3,616) made them win an overall of 26 residents, a 0.1 % population increase. This stagnant situation is a very different picture from the dynamism observed in the following categories.

Category 3 comprises 159 rural municipalities, 32.9 per cent of the population analysed. On average, each category 3 village gained 63 inhabitants, 24 of which Spanish nationals and 39 from other nationalities. They also had negative natural growth (-3.564), though their net migration was much more positive, as they won a global total of 13,529 residents for this reason. Therefore, these villages’ population augmented a considerable 18.3 per cent.

Category 4 consists of 50 municipalities and 16.8 per cent of the rural population. The number of inhabitants increased rapidly (32.3 per cent), due to migratory flows. On average, 87 Spanish nationals and 70 aliens migrated to each of these villages. Natural growth rates were slightly negative (-867), though nevertheless compensated by a markedly positive migratory growth (+8,733 people), resulting in 7,866 new inhabitants (4,330 additional Spanish citizens and 3,536 foreigners). In sum, category 4 municipalities gained more Spanish than foreign population.

Category 5 comprehends 36 villages, 7.5 per cent of those studied, holding 13.6 per cent of the population analysed. They globally won 8,273 local and 2,342 alien
nationality residents (i.e. 230 Spaniards and 65 foreigners per village). They even enjoyed positive natural growth (+246), being the only category in which births were higher than deaths. This was basically due to the arrival of young Spanish immigrants rejuvenating its population structure. Nevertheless, these villages’ outstanding population growth was mainly driven by their extraordinarily high net migration (10,369 new residents). Between 1996 and 2009, they nearly doubled their population, increasing from 15,550 to 26,165 inhabitants, thus incorporating 10,615 new residents. In other words, they had an impressive 68.3 per cent population gain.

In sum, 49 per cent of the villages which hold 36.7 per cent of the population analysed had a receding or stagnant population. They pertain to categories 1 and 2 and are basically located in inland Catalonia, or more specifically, in the hilly and poorly communicated region situated where Lleida, Tarragona and Barcelona province borders meet. The other half grew, and some, even significantly. As shown by figure 5, the latter are found in quite precise areas:

**FIGURE 5**

- Near Barcelona and Tarragona-Reus metropolitan areas. These are category 4 and, especially, category 5 municipalities. Through suburbanisation, they are mainly receiving Spanish immigrants –basically young urban families– together with some foreigners. This phenomenon, which is reaching small municipalities increasingly further away from urban cores, has been observed in several Spanish regions (see Tort, 2002, and Pujadas, 2009, for Catalonia, Sánchez-García, 2002, for Madrid/Toledo or Aldrey, 2002, for Galicia).

- Empordà and Baix Ebre. These are category 3 and 4 municipalities. They are basically located in tourist areas relatively near the sea. Foreigners have moved
there both for residential (EU-15 citizens) and work related reasons (the other
nationalities).

- Pyrenees. These are mainly tourist and residential villages pertaining to category
3 and, to a minor extent, to category 4. Foreigners migrated there for the same
reasons as those of the former paragraph.

Table 1 also shows how the proportions of foreigners in each of the five categories
have changed between 1998 and 2009. However, these do not only depend on non-
national population growth, but also on that of Spaniards. Category 3 and 4
municipalities have the highest foreigner shares, which attain a maximum of 11 per cent
and 12.2 per cent of their respective 2009 populations. Category 5 villages, those which
have had the most elevated demographic increase, possess somewhat smaller (9.9 per
cent) alien shares, as large Spanish flows have moved to these villages. Finally, despite
Spanish population is declining, category 1 and 2 municipalities show the two lowest
foreigner percentages (7.8 per cent and 5.3 per cent respectively).

Figure 6 shows continental nationality groups by category. The two extreme ones –1
and 5– have utterly different foreign nationality compositions. As category 1
municipalities are mainly devoted to agriculture and contain few residential and tourist
developments, non former EU-15 European citizens (41.6 per cent of all foreigners,
mostly Romanians) and Africans (33.5 per cent, basically from Morocco) are over-
represented. This would also explain why former EU-15 and American (mainly Latin-
American) percentages are so meagre. By contrast, category 5 municipalities, those
nearest to metropolitan areas and which have the most suburban features, are the ones
that, like larger towns and cities, have the highest percentages of EU-15 residents (31
per cent of all foreigners) and (Latin)American (21 per cent). The latter particularly
work in the more dynamic tertiary sector, and, in the case of male Latinos, in
construction. Categories 3 and 4 also have significant proportions of western European retired people basically attracted by tourist and residential areas.

FIGURE 6

Finally, figure 7 shows the age and sex structure by nationality. The five pyramids, each belonging to one of the categories, reflect both Spanish nationals’ demographic structure and dynamics, and the effect of recent migratory flows on them. As explained, categories 3 and 4 have the highest proportions of foreigners. Between the age of 20 and 29, they even represent more than 20 per cent of the population in that age group. In the Category 5 pyramid however, they are much less significant. These new basically suburban municipalities, to which large volumes of Spanish-nationality families have moved, stand out for possessing the most elevated proportions of young adults and children. Percentages of elderly only attain 15.3 per cent while those of children under 15 reach 16.8 per cent. The opposite can be observed in the narrow based and broad summit category 1 and 2 pyramids, pertaining to the less developed villages. They have the lowest proportions of aliens and the highest elderly people ones. For example, 28.6 per cent of the population in category 1 municipalities is over 65 while percentages those under the age of 15 only reach 9.8 per cent.

FIGURE 7

If 2001 census data on the economic activities undertaken by employed residents living in municipalities with less than 1,000 inhabitants are closely examined, a clear trend becomes visible: the higher the amount of people working in agriculture, the more demographically regressive a municipality is. While 29.4 and 25 per cent of the category 1 and 2 municipalities’ active population works in agriculture, these figures only attain 18 per cent in category 3 ones, 14 per cent in category 4 ones, and 11 per
cent in those in category 5. However, the opposite trend is found for the tertiary sector, as its percentages vary from 38 per cent (category 1) to 54 per cent (category 5).

Regarding industry and construction sectors, differences between categories do not seem to be relevant. Nevertheless, changes in the number people employed in these two economic sectors between 1991 and 2001, would be more significant. Most outstandingly, between these two dates, category 1 inhabitants working in industry decreased by 20 per cent. Those of category 2 municipalities also fell, though only by 2 per cent. This negative trend would mainly be explained by the fact that several industries, like the textile or other residual activities, moved away from these areas. Conversely, industrial workers living in category 5 municipalities show a 25 per cent increase. These would mainly commute to nearby urban areas or work in industries which have been relocated to rural areas (González-Rodríguez, 2011). Category 5 inhabitants working in construction and in the services sector would have grown even more (69 per cent and 111 per cent respectively). In the much less dynamic type 1 municipalities, people working in these two sectors have also increased, although to a minor extent (28.4 per cent and 51 per cent, respectively). Finally, in the other three municipality categories, these two sectors had intermediate employment growth rates, though differences among them are considered as hardly significant.

In sum, the two main factors behind municipality population growth differences would seem to be location –near urban centres or in tourist areas– and labour diversification. Small municipalities situated near metropolitan areas or well communicated with them, are those which have demographically increased more. They enjoy younger populations due to suburban immigration and their productive structure shows diversified features. In other words, their active population, which has significantly grown during the economic boom years, mainly works in the industrial,
construction and services sectors. The second group of small municipalities also showing positive, though lower, population growth would be picturesque and tourist villages usually situated in mountainous or coastal areas. Their tertiary sector, particularly tourism and construction, has highly been developed and offer immigrants many jobs. Finally, there are rural municipalities which do not benefit from the previous advantages. For them, agriculture, though declining, is still relevant, while industry is increasingly marginal. Their population is ageing and their numbers are stagnant or even decline –depending on whether incoming foreigners compensate the departure of Spaniards or not.

5. Conclusions

By focusing on the impact of foreign migration on the spatial and demographic dynamics of Catalan rural municipalities, we intended to provide answers to several questions. Firstly, whether or not international migration is ending secular rural depopulation, and therefore rural population is giving signs of demographic recovery. Results indicate that the answer would basically be positive, though nuances should also be introduced. Despite increasing their 1996 population by 15 per cent, villages up to 1,000 inhabitants still show –with few exceptions– negative natural growth rates, losing 6 per cent of their initial population for this reason. Thus, changes have basically been produced by immigration, in general, and international flows, in particular, as the latter represent 63 per cent of the net increase.

As formerly observed, foreign immigration has increased throughout Catalonia. These are recent flows, so the issue of whether immigrants will continue residing in rural areas mainly devoted to agriculture once they obtain a stable position within the Spanish labour market, have a legal residence permit, and are able to apply for better
jobs, still remains unanswered. Evidence from other southern European countries would all point in the same direction. Once foreign migrants who firstly migrated to rural areas and worked in agriculture are regularised, they seem to move to other economic sectors and to other geographical areas (Kasimis, 2008).

The second question on whether foreign immigrants settling in rural areas were substituting a declining Spanish population, or, on the contrary, were stimulating a demographic recovery of the autochthonous stock, should also be replied ambivalently, that is to say, depending on the municipality. Despite 90 per cent of the Catalan rural municipalities possess negative natural growth rates and 43 per cent lose Spanish nationality inhabitants, two out of three villages gain population through migratory inflows.

In other words, as Spanish population is hardly dynamic, nearly half (49 per cent) of the rural municipalities –basically the most interior ones, those furthest away from the metropolitan areas and coastal and Pyrenees regions– continue to have a decreasing (category 1 municipalities) or stagnant population (category 2).

Migratory flows have certainly been one of the most significant elements spatially reconfiguring scarcely populated areas and drawing new territorial patterns. While foreign immigration has had a profound effect on category 3 and 4 villages, it has had much less impact on type 1 and 2 ones. Here, foreign immigration has not been strong enough to change ageing nor demographic stagnation. Finally, Spanish-nationality flows towards suburban areas have become category 5 municipality main population change driver.

Pyramids have shown that, although population structures –particularly those of category 3 and 4 municipalities– have been rejuvenated through foreign immigrant
flows, ageing continues to be the dominant feature of Catalan rural municipalities. Category 5 nuclei, basically suburban villages receiving young Spanish family flows, would once again be the only exception, as their population structure is even younger than that of Catalonia as a whole and, additionally, also enjoys positive natural growth.

Former findings help us answer the last question on whether these spatially diversified flows have intensified differences between Catalan rural municipalities. Indeed, Spanish and foreign flow intensification has played a significant role in establishing a spatial dichotomy between “dynamic” rural areas (category 3, 4 and 5 villages) and “regressive” ones (categories 1 and 2). The former concentrate in four areas: 1) near Barcelona and Tarragona-Reus metropolitan areas, where suburbanisation is expanding increasingly away from urban cores; 2) the Empordà – close to tourist Costa Brava, in Girona province; 3) several interior Tarragona province municipalities – not far from Costa Daurada resorts; and finally 4) the Pyrenees. The rest, around half of the Catalan villages analysed, mainly situated in the most interior, hilly and less productive areas of Lleida, Tarragona and Barcelona province peripheries, should be considered the less developed rural areas. These results for Catalonia would support Elbersen’s (2001) assertion that transformations from an agriculture-centred productivist countryside to a consumption-oriented (post-productivist) one, and their growing integration with urban areas, would have led to a increasing differentiation of rural areas. However, considering neo-productivism from Menor-Toribio (2000) and Armesto's (2005) perspective, this growing spatial diversification can also be regarded as a way of measuring how successful has each of the Catalan rural municipalities been in their transition from the productivist to the neo-productivist phase.

In sum, the three interlinked elements acting upon rural Catalonia’s demographic change seem to be: municipalities’ geographic location, new labour opportunities, and
immigration. Indeed, growing municipalities are either close to large urban areas, and thus influenced by suburbanisation, or in tourist areas. These locations additionally favour residential developments and new mainly services sector related economic activities which, in turn, attract both retired (King et al., 2000) and economic immigrants. Results would therefore confirm that in these dynamic villages there is what Nelson and Nelson (2010) described as a mutual feedback between counterurbanisation and international labour migration, or what Buller and Hoggart (1994) and Halfacree (2008), among other authors, call ‘international counterurbanisation’.

At the other end of the scale, there are the less economically and demographically dynamic rural municipalities, those lacking these location advantages, which have inherited an agrarian-based economy and an underdeveloped tertiary sector. Moreover, deindustrialisation has especially struck those villages where the textile industry had particularly been relevant. As a consequence, they have a decreasing and ageing population. This trend has not even been changed by international immigration, as the arrival of foreigners has hardly compensated the departure of (young) natives seeking a better life and labour perspectives in urban areas or in other more prosperous rural ones.

In conclusion, despite nearly all small municipalities have received foreign migrants, though with obvious magnitude differences, counterurbanisation has not spread across all rural Catalonia and there has been an increasing spatial polarisation of population trends. Coming back to the title’s question, at least for a significant part of the small Catalan municipalities, foreign immigration has not been the solution to rural depopulation, and this would also probably be applicable to most of rural Spain.

Though the analysis ends in 2009, current and future developments will undoubtedly introduce additional changes. Furthering knowledge on the effects of the present
economic recession on migratory flows, especially if we are facing a structural long lasting crisis and not just a temporary, short term one, would be particularly interesting. Recent evidence for Catalonia would seem to indicate that, while international out-migration is increasing, both entries from abroad and local and foreign migrant internal flows are declining (Bayona et al. 2011). Therefore, rural population growth rates should fall, though high foreigner unemployment rates in cities could also prevent rural foreign immigrants from moving to urban areas. Furthermore, lower housing prices in villages could even attract some urbanites which cannot afford to continue living in cities. In fact, these trends can be a way of redistributing population in favour of scarcely populated areas and therefore affect future regional demographic dynamics. For this reason, we consider that these trends deserve to be carefully followed and studied, as does the impact of the crisis on the economic and social conditions of former national and foreigner immigrants. Indeed, while they settled in rural areas during economic growth, they are now facing a long lasting recession which is particularly increasing foreigner unemployment rates, though also local nationality ones. In sum, all these future trends can be considered a key issue because, as Collantes et al. (2010) claims, repopulation is a long term phenomenon. Foreign immigration’s long term impact will depend on these small villages’ capacity to absorb new migrants but also on the latter’s ability to adapt, not only to the rural environment, but to the changing economic context too.
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Notes

1 Padrón data for small municipalities can sometimes be slightly problematic as it may contain some of the so called “atypical” registrations, i.e., those in which the person’s usual place of residence and that where they are registered does not coincide. This problem would be particularly related to the development of second homes (López-Colás and Módenes, 2005) and seems to be especially relevant at Pyrenean municipalities and the smallest villages. It would particularly affect Spanish students and workers, many of which have not actually permanently migrated to rural areas, but only occasionally (on holidays and weekends) reside there. However, immigrants would seem to be much less concerned (Sabater and Ajenjo, 2005; Ajenjo and Sabater, 2006).

2 A comarca is an administrative unit grouping contiguous municipalities. In size, it would approximately be equivalent to a small county.

3 The Pyrenees are both benefiting from the development of winter tourism (López Palomeque, 1996) and from what some authors call “natururbanisation” or the urbanisation of nature. This would be a specific type of counterurbanisation in which demographic growth is linked to the existence of protected natural spaces acting as population attraction poles (Prados, 2006; Tulla et al., 2007).

4 However, for the most regressive small villages, undergoing strong ageing processes, retirement benefits are actually the main income source.
This trend however differs from that observed in other similar Spanish rural areas (Roquer and Blay, 2008), as, between 1996 and 2009, Spanish municipalities under 1,000 inhabitants lost up to 105,694 dwellers, that is to say, 7.5 per cent of their population.

Their varied origins and their widespread distribution across the region become clearly visible when the four villages that have the highest foreigner shares (coincidently each belonging to one of the four formerly described rural areas) are analysed. Pau (in the Alt Empordà comarca – Girona province) has the highest levels, as 35.8 per cent of its population (207 out of its 578 inhabitants) comes from other countries –mainly France, Germany, Britain, and Morocco. Pratdip (Tarragona province) where its 300 non-nationals (mostly Germans, French, Moroccans and Belgians) represent 35.6 per cent of its 843 inhabitants, would be the second one down on that list. La Portella (Segrià agrarian plain –Lleida province) where 261 out of its 775 residents, that is to say, 33.7 per cent of its population, are foreigners –basically Romanians, Ukrainians, Chinese and Senegalese– occupies the third place. Finally, there is Esterri d’Àneu (in the Pyrenees, Lleida province), in which the percentage of foreigners reaches 33.5 per cent (323 inhabitants), mostly Romanians, Brazilians and Portuguese.

Cluster analysis assigns cases –here municipalities– to groups which are both as internally homogenous as possible though also as different from one another, so that errors are reduced to a minimum. For this specific paper authors used hierarchical clustering, with typified variables. Ward’s method, measuring squared Euclidean distances, has been used as the linkage criterion.
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Figure 1. Catalan municipalities with less than 1,000 inhabitants.

Source: 2009 INE padrón data.
Note: shading <1,000 inhabitant municipalities.

Figure 2. Absolute population figures (left axis) and average annual growth rates (right axis) between 1900 and 2009 for Catalan municipalities under 1,000 inhabitants in 2009.
Source: INE census and padrón data.

**Figure 3. Foreign population size changes by continental origin and municipality size. Catalonia, 1998 to 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 1,000 inhabitants</th>
<th>More than 1,000 inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6500</td>
<td>650000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>600000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500</td>
<td>550000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td>450000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>350000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>150000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Figure 4. Foreigners living in Catalan rural municipalities: absolute figures and distribution by continental origin, 2009.**
Table 1. Municipality classification (cluster) according to Spanish, foreigner and overall population change, 1996-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1996-09 growth</th>
<th>Type 1 mean</th>
<th>Type 2 mean</th>
<th>Type 3 mean</th>
<th>Type 4 mean</th>
<th>Type 5 mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities (%) 96-09</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Negative</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-92</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Change</td>
<td>-3215</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9965</td>
<td>7866</td>
<td>10615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-5183</td>
<td>-1725</td>
<td>3796</td>
<td>4330</td>
<td>8273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>6169</td>
<td>3536</td>
<td>2342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Growth</td>
<td>-3293</td>
<td>-3590</td>
<td>-3564</td>
<td>-867</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory Growth</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3616</td>
<td>13529</td>
<td>8733</td>
<td>10369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigner share (1998)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigner share (2009)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5. Spatial distribution of cluster categories, Catalonia, 2009.
Source: INE 2009 *Padrón continuo*

Figure 6. Foreign population living in the five municipality categories by continental origin -absolute values in the left axis, proportions (per cent) above bars, 2009.

Source: 2009 *Padrón continuo* (INE)
Figure 7. Population structure by age, sex and nationality for the five municipality categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>CAT 1</th>
<th>CAT 2</th>
<th>CAT 3</th>
<th>CAT 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95 and +</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAT 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Spanish men**
- **Spanish women**
- **Foreigners men**
- **Foreigners women**

Source: INE 2009 *Padrón continuo* data.